

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

CRAIG GAMBLE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BOYD GAMING CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-01009-JCM-PAL

ORDER

(Mtn to Seal – Dkt. #149)

This matter is before the court on Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion to Seal ECF Nos. 142 and 145 (Dkt. #149) filed October 10, 2014. The court has considered the Motion.


Plaintiffs seek an order pursuant to LR 10-5(b) allowing them to file the Notices of Consent to Join (Dkt. ##142, 145), which counsel inadvertently filed without redacting personal identification information about the opt-in Plaintiffs, including the Plaintiffs' addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses. Plaintiffs' counsel represents that it had prepared the consents with appropriate redactions for filing, but uploaded the wrong document into the court's CM/ECF system. Since that time, Plaintiffs' counsel have filed Notices of Corrected Images (Dkt. ##144, 146), and the Clerk of Court has redacted the personal identifying information pursuant to the court's electronic filing procedures. Plaintiffs have established good cause to seal the opt-in Plaintiffs' personal identification information. *See, e.g., Ruffin v. Dir. Nev. Dept. of Corr.*, 2009 WL 1294423 at *3 (D. Nev. May 4, 2009) (finding a compelling need existed to protect an individual's personal identifying information from improper use by public disclosure that outweighed the public's interest in open access to court records). The Ninth Circuit has recognized that filing documents in the public record, while redacting identifying information (i.e., names, addresses, telephone numbers, and social security numbers), is preferable to filing

1 an entire document under seal. *See, e.g., Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122,
2 1137 (9th Cir. 2003). Here, the Clerk of Court has already redacted the personal identifiers from
3 the Notices of Consent to Join, and therefore, the court need not seal them.

4 For the foregoing reasons,

5 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion to Seal ECF Nos. 142 and 145
6 (Dkt. #149) is DENIED AS MOOT.

7 Dated this 12th day of November, 2014.

8
9
10 
11 PEGGY A. LEEN
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28